

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Gary M. Moore

Assignee: Moore Epitaxial Inc.

Title: GAS FLOW CONTROLLER SYSTEM

Serial No.: 09/399,611

Filed: September 20, 1999

Examiner: Bueker, R.

Group Art Unit: 1763

Docket No.: MTEC1010

#12
1/7/02
MW

Monterey, CA
January 2, 2002

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JAN - 3 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

RESPONSE TO COMMUNICATION

Dear Sir:

This is a response to the Communication dated December 4, 2001, paper number 11. This Response is supplemental to the Amendment filed on September 19, 2001.

REMARKS

Claims 10-11 and 35 are patentable over Shinriki et al.

In the Communication dated December 4, 2001, the Examiner states:

The reply filed on Sept. 24, 2001 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omissions(s) or matter(s): regarding independent claims 10 and 35, particularly claim 35, applicant has not pointed out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable over the references cited. Applicant indicates that claims 10 and 35 are allowable for reasons similar to the reasons advanced for claim 1, but those reasons were based on claim 1 limitations that are not found in claims 10 and 35.